

Massive-scale estimation of exponential-family random graph models with local dependence

Sergii Babkin

Michael Schweinberger*

Abstract

A flexible approach to modeling network data is based on exponential-family random graph models. We consider here exponential-family random graph models with additional structure in the form of local dependence, which have important conceptual and statistical advantages over models without additional structure. An open problem is how to estimate such models from large random graphs. We pave the ground for massive-scale estimation of such models by exploiting model structure for the purpose of parallel computing. The main idea is that we can first decompose random graphs into subgraphs with local dependence and then perform parallel computing on subgraphs. We hence propose a two-step likelihood-based approach. The first step estimates the local structure underlying random graphs. The second step estimates parameters given the estimated local structure of random graphs. Both steps can be implemented in parallel, which enables massive-scale estimation. We demonstrate the advantages of the two-step likelihood-based approach by simulations and an application to a large Amazon product network.

Keywords: social networks, stochastic block models, variational methods, EM algorithms, MM algorithms

1 Introduction

Models of network data are in high demand in statistics and related areas (Kolaczyk 2009). Such models are useful for studying insurgent and terrorist networks, contact networks facilitating the spread of infectious diseases, social networks, the World Wide Web, and other networks of interest.

A flexible approach to modeling network data is based on exponential-family random graph models (Frank & Strauss 1986, Lusher et al. 2013). While exponential-family random graph models are widely used by network scientists (Lusher et al. 2013), statistical inference for exponential-family random graph models is challenging. One reason is that some

*The research of both authors was supported by NSF award DMS-1513644.

models, such as the classic models of Frank & Strauss (1986), are ill-posed and allow edges to depend on many other edges in the network. Applying such models to large networks is problematic: e.g., a friendship between two users of Facebook may depend on friendships with other users, but it is not plausible that it depends on friendships with billions of other users. As a result, such models can induce strong dependence among edges, which in turn can lead to model degeneracy (Handcock 2003, Schweinberger 2011, Chatterjee & Diaconis 2013). Model degeneracy means that models place much probability mass on sufficient statistics close to the boundary of the convex hull of the sufficient statistics (Schweinberger 2011). If graphs are generated by such models, the sufficient statistics of the generated graphs tend to be close to the boundary of the convex hull, which implies that maximum likelihood estimators either do not exist at all or are hard to obtain by maximum likelihood algorithms (Handcock 2003, Rinaldo et al. 2009). In addition, the results of Shalizi & Rinaldo (2013) suggest that maximum likelihood estimators of some models may not be consistent.

To address the problems of exponential-family random graph models, Schweinberger & Handcock (2015) proposed exponential-family random graph models with additional structure. The basic idea is that random graphs are endowed with additional structure in the form of neighborhood structure and that the dependence induced by the models is local in the sense that it is restricted to neighborhoods. Such exponential-family random graph models with additional structure, which we call exponential-family random graph models with local dependence, have at least two important advantages over exponential-family random graph models without additional structure. First, local dependence induces weak dependence and models with weak dependence are less prone to model degeneracy (e.g., Schweinberger & Stewart 2016, Corollary 1). Second, models with local dependence satisfy a weak form of self-consistency in the sense that these models are consistent under neighborhood sampling (Schweinberger & Handcock 2015, Theorem 1). While the notion of consistency under neighborhood sampling is weaker than the notion of consistency under sampling of Shalizi & Rinaldo (2013), it enables consistent estimation of neighborhood-dependent parameters. Schweinberger & Stewart (2016) showed that when the neighborhood structure is known and the neighborhoods grow at the same rate, M -estimators of neighborhood-dependent parameters of canonical and curved exponential-family random graph models with local dependence are consistent. Schweinberger (2017) showed that when the neighborhood structure is unknown, it can be recovered with high probability.

While these consistency results suggest that exponential-family random graph models with additional structure have important conceptual and statistical advantages over exponential-family random graph models without additional structure, there are no methods for estimating them from large random graphs. Schweinberger & Handcock (2015) used Bayesian methods to estimate them, but Bayesian methods are too time-consuming to be applied to random graphs with more than one hundred nodes. We pave the ground for massive-scale estimation of such models by proposing a two-step likelihood-based ap-

proach that exploits model structure for the purpose of parallel computing. The main idea is that random graphs can be decomposed into subgraphs with local dependence and hence parallel computing can be used to compute the contributions of subgraphs to the likelihood function. Motivated by these considerations, we propose a two-step likelihood-based approach. The first step estimates the neighborhood structure and decomposes random graphs into subgraphs with local dependence. The decomposition of the random graph relies on approximations of the likelihood function that are supported by theoretical results. The second step estimates parameters given the estimated neighborhood structure by using Monte Carlo maximum likelihood methods (Hunter & Handcock 2006). Both steps can be implemented in parallel, which enables massive-scale estimation on multi-core computers or computing clusters. We demonstrate the advantages of the two-step likelihood-based approach by simulations and an application to a large Amazon product network.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces models. Section 3 discusses likelihood-based inference based on approximations of the likelihood function that are supported by theoretical results and Section 4 takes advantage of such approximations to estimate models. Section 5 presents simulation results and Section 6 applications.

Other, related literature. It is worth noting that a recent paper by Thiemichen & Kauermann (2017) considers estimating nonparametric exponential-family random graph models from large networks. We consider a more challenging task than Thiemichen & Kauermann (2017), because we consider models with additional structure in the form of neighborhood structure and focus on the estimation of neighborhood structure as well as parameters, whereas Thiemichen & Kauermann (2017) consider models without neighborhood structure and focus on the estimation of parameters.

2 Models

To introduce exponential-family random graph models with additional structure, let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, \dots, n\}$ be a set of nodes and $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ be a subset of edges between pairs of nodes. Throughout, we consider undirected random graphs without self-edges, i.e., we assume that $(i, i) \notin \mathcal{E}$ and $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ implies and is implied by $(j, i) \in \mathcal{E}$, but all models discussed here can be extended to directed random graphs. We regard edges as random variables denoted by $X_{i,j}$, where $X_{i,j}$ takes on values in a countable set $\mathbb{X}_{i,j}$, i.e., we consider both binary and non-binary, network count data. We write $\mathbf{X} = (X_{i,j})_{i < j}^n$ and $\mathbb{X} = \times_{i < j}^n \mathbb{X}_{i,j}$.

We assume that the random graph $\mathbf{X}$ is governed by an exponential family with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ and probability mass functions of the form

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\mathbf{x}) = \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, s(\mathbf{x}) \rangle - \psi(\boldsymbol{\eta})), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}, \quad (1)$$

where $\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, s(\mathbf{x}) \rangle$ is the inner product of a natural parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{N} = \{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\boldsymbol{\eta})} :$

$\psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) < \infty\}$ and a vector of sufficient statistics $s : \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\boldsymbol{\eta})}$ and

$$\psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \log \sum_{\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{X}} \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, s(\mathbf{x}') \rangle).$$

We consider here exponential-family random graph models with additional structure, which have important conceptual and statistical advantages over exponential-family random graph models without additional structure, as discussed in Section 1. The additional structure takes the form of a partition of the set of nodes $\mathcal{A}$ into subsets of nodes $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_K$, called neighborhoods, such that the dependence is local. To introduce the notion of local dependence, assume that $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \boldsymbol{\Xi} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is a function of a neighborhood-dependent parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ and a neighborhood membership vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ consists of neighborhood memberships z_i such that $z_{i,k} = 1$ if node i belongs to neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$ and $z_{i,k} = 0$ otherwise. We henceforth denote by $\mathbf{X}_{k,k} = (X_{i,j})_{i < j: z_{i,k}=z_{j,k}=1}^n$ the sequence of within-neighborhood edge variables of neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$).

Definition. Local dependence. An exponential-family random graph model with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ satisfies local dependence as long as

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^K p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}_{k,k}) \prod_{l=1}^{k-1} \prod_{i,j: z_{i,k}=1, z_{j,l}=1}^n p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(x_{i,j}), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}. \quad (2)$$

In other words, the dependence is local in the sense that it is confined to within-neighborhood subgraphs. Schweinberger & Stewart (2016, Corollary 1) showed that models with local dependence induce weak dependence and are less prone to model degeneracy than models without local dependence as long as the neighborhoods are not too large. Schweinberger & Stewart (2016) and Schweinberger (2017) detail conditions under which consistent estimation of models with local dependence is possible.

An example of exponential-family random graph models with local dependence and support $\mathbb{X} = \{0, 1\}^{\binom{n}{2}}$ is given by

$$p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp \left(\sum_{k \leq l} \theta_{1,k,l} \sum_{i < j} x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,l} + \sum_{k=1}^K \theta_{2,k,k} \sum_{i < j} x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,k} \max_{h \neq i,j} x_{i,h} x_{j,h} z_{h,k} \right).$$

The model includes between- and within-neighborhood edge terms and within-neighborhood transitive edge terms. The transitive edge statistics $x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,k} \max_{h \neq i,j} x_{i,h} x_{j,h} z_{h,k}$ capture transitive closure and induce dependence among edges, but the dependence is confined to within-neighborhood subgraphs and is hence local.

A special case of exponential-family random graph models with local dependence are stochastic block models (Nowicki & Snijders 2001): e.g., consider the model above and let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_{1,k,l})_{k \leq l}^K$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = (\theta_{2,k,k})_{k=1}^K$; then $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ reduces the model to a model with between- and within-neighborhood edge terms, which corresponds to a stochastic block model that assumes edges to be independent Bernoulli($\mu_{k,l}$) random variables with $\mu_{k,l} = \text{logit}^{-1}(\theta_{1,k,l})$.

3 Likelihood-based inference

While it is natural to base statistical inference concerning $\mathbf{z}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ on the likelihood function, likelihood-based inference for exponential-family random graph models with local dependence is challenging. The main reason is that the probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is intractable, because the within-neighborhood probability mass functions $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}_{k,k})$ are intractable. The intractability of $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}_{k,k})$ is rooted in the fact that its normalizing constant is a sum over all possible within-neighborhood subgraphs of neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$, which cannot be computed unless $\mathcal{A}_k$ is small, i.e., $|\mathcal{A}_k| \ll 10$ ($k = 1, \dots, K$).

To facilitate likelihood-based inference, we introduce tractable approximations of the intractable probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ in Section 3.1 and support them by theoretical results in Section 3.2. A statistical algorithm that takes advantage of such approximations is introduced in Section 4.

3.1 Approximate likelihood functions: motivation

Suppose that we want to estimate both $\mathbf{z}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. It is natural to estimate them by using an iterative algorithm that cycles through updates of $\mathbf{z}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as follows:

1. Update $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.
2. Update $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\mathbf{z}$.

The algorithm sketched above is generic and cannot be used in practice, but regardless of which specific algorithm is used—whether EM, Monte Carlo EM, variational EM, Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo, or other algorithms—most of them have in common that Step 1 is either infeasible or time-consuming, whereas Step 2 is less problematic than Step 1.

Step 1 Step 1 is either infeasible or time-consuming, because the probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is intractable. To demonstrate, consider a Bayesian Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm that updates $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ by Gibbs sampling. Gibbs sampling of $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ turns out to be infeasible, because the full conditional distributions of $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ depend on the intractable within-neighborhood probability mass functions $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}_{k,k})$. One could approximate them by Monte Carlo samples of within-neighborhood subgraphs, but such approximations may not generate Markov chain Monte Carlo samples from the target distribution (Liang et al. 2016) and are problematic on computational grounds:

- Using Monte Carlo approximations of within-neighborhood probability mass functions is infeasible when the number of nodes n is large, because such approximations are needed for each update of each of the n neighborhood memberships $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$.

- Worse, the n neighborhood memberships $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ cannot be updated in parallel, because the neighborhood membership of one node depends on the neighborhood memberships of other nodes.

Therefore, Step 1 is infeasible when n is large.

Step 2 Step 2 is less problematic than Step 1. While the probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is intractable and may have to be approximated by Monte Carlo methods (Hunter & Handcock 2006), such Monte Carlo approximations are needed once to update $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$, whereas Monte Carlo approximations are needed n times to update $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ one by one, which renders Step 1 infeasible when n is large. In addition, the probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ decomposes into between- and within-neighborhood probability mass functions $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}_{k,l})$ and hence within-neighborhood probability mass functions can be approximated in parallel.

Approximations To enable feasible updates of $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ when n is large, we are interested in approximating the intractable probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ by a tractable probability mass function. To do so, we confine attention to exponential-family random graph models with between- and within-neighborhood edge terms of the form $\sum_{k \leq l}^K \theta_{1,k,l} \sum_{i < j}^n x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,l}$ with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\theta_{1,k,l})_{k \leq l}^K$ and additional model terms with parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$ such that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ eliminates the additional model terms. An example is given by the edge and transitive edge model in Section 2. Such models have two useful properties:

- The probability mass functions $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ impose the same probability law on between-neighborhood subgraphs.
- The probability mass function $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is tractable, because edges between and within neighborhoods are independent given $\mathbf{z}$.

We henceforth approximate $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ by $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$, which corresponds to the probability mass function of a stochastic block model.

The idea underlying the approximation is that when the neighborhoods are not too large, most of the random graph corresponds to between-neighborhood subgraphs. Since $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ impose the same probability law on between-neighborhood subgraphs, $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ agree on most of the random graph. Therefore, $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ can be approximated by $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ for the purpose of updating $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. Suppose, e.g., that we consider to update $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ by replacing $\mathbf{z}$ by some $\mathbf{z}' \neq \mathbf{z}$. We may decide to do so if the loglikelihood ratio

$$\log \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}') }(\mathbf{x})}{p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) }(\mathbf{x})} = \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}') }(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) }(\mathbf{x})$$

is large. If $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ can be approximated by $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$, we can base the decision on $\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ rather than $\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$, because

$$\begin{aligned} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) &= [\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})] \\ + [\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x})] &- [\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as long as

$$\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})|$$

is small, we have

$$\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) \approx \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}')}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}).$$

The advantage of approximating $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ by $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is that there exist methods for stochastic block models to estimate the neighborhood structure from large networks (e.g., Daudin et al. 2008, Rohe et al. 2011, Amini et al. 2013, Vu et al. 2013). We take advantage of such methods in Section 4, but we first shed light on the conditions under which $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})|$ is small.

3.2 Approximate likelihood functions: theoretical results

We show that updates of $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be based on $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ rather than $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ by showing that

$$\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})|$$

is small with high probability provided that the neighborhoods are not too large and the random graph is not too sparse.

To do so, we make the following assumptions. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \Xi$ and that $\Xi \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbb{N})$ is a subset of the interior $\text{int}(\mathbb{N})$ of the natural parameter space $\mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbb{E} \equiv \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}^*}$ be the expectation under the data-generating parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}^* \equiv \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)$, where $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z}$ denotes the data-generating values of $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z}$. We denote by $d : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_0^+$ the Hamming metric, which is defined by

$$d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbb{1}_{x_{1,i,j} \neq x_{2,i,j}}, \quad (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X},$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{x_{1,i,j} \neq x_{2,i,j}}$ is 1 if $x_{1,i,j} \neq x_{2,i,j}$ and is 0 otherwise. The ℓ_1 -, ℓ_2 -, and ℓ_∞ -norm of vectors are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_1$, $\|\cdot\|_2$, and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, respectively. In the following, we denote by $n_{\max}(\mathbf{z})$ the size of the largest neighborhood under $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}$. The size of the largest data-generating neighborhood is denoted by $\|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |\mathcal{A}_k|$. The main assumptions can then be stated as follows.

[C.1] There exists $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$, all $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\boldsymbol{\eta})}$, and all $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}$,

$$|\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}, s(\mathbf{x}_1) - s(\mathbf{x}_2) \rangle| \leq c d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) n_{\max}(\mathbf{z}) \log n.$$

[C.2] There exists $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$, all $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,2}) \in \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k,l} \times \boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k,l}$, and all $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z}$,

$$|\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,1}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,2}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})} s_{k,l}(\mathbf{X}) \rangle| \leq c \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,1} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l,2}\|_2 n_{\max}(\mathbf{z})^2 \log n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l}, \mathbf{z})$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l}$, and $s_{k,l}(\mathbf{x})$ denote the subvectors of $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $s(\mathbf{x})$ corresponding to the subgraph between neighborhoods k and l ($k < l$) or the subgraph of neighborhood k ($k = l$) and $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k,l}$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{\dim(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,l})}$ ($k \leq l = 1, \dots, K$).

Conditions [C.1] and [C.2] are satisfied by most exponential-family random graph models of interest, which can be shown by arguments along the lines of Schweinberger (2017, Corollaries 1 and 2). We note that conditions [C.1] and [C.2] cover the size-dependent parameterizations used in Sections 5 and 6, which give rise to the logarithmic terms in [C.1] and [C.2].

The following result shows that $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})|$ is small with high probability provided that the neighborhoods are not too large and the random graph is not too sparse, where the maximum is taken over a subset of well-behaved neighborhood structures.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that a random graph is governed by an exponential-family random graph model with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ and local dependence satisfying conditions [C.1] and [C.2]. Let $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a subset of neighborhood structures such that $n_{\max}(\mathbf{z}) \leq n_{\max}$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}$, where $n_{\max}$ may increase as a function of the number of nodes n provided $n_{\max} \leq n$. Then, for all $\delta > 0$, there exist $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})| \geq c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2} \right) \leq \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon = 2 \exp(-\delta n \log n / 4)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 can be found in the supplement. The basic idea underlying Theorem 1 is that the deviation $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})|$ cannot be too large when the neighborhoods are not too large, because most of the random graph corresponds to between-neighborhood subgraphs and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ impose the same probability law on between-neighborhood subgraphs. To make the informal statements about the sizes of neighborhoods and the size of the deviation $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})|$ more precise, we compare the size of the deviation $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})|$ to the expected loglikelihood function $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$, which is a convenient measure of the size of the random graph. We note that, while it is tempting to

believe that the size of the random graph is equal to the number of possible edges $\binom{n}{2}$, the size of the random graph depends on the sparsity of the random graph. The notion of sparsity of random graphs is motivated by the observation that most real-world networks are sparse in the sense that the observed number of edges is much smaller than the number of possible edges $\binom{n}{2}$. We call random graphs dense when $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$ grows as $\binom{n}{2}$ and sparse otherwise. It is worth noting that the classic definition of sparsity is based on the expectation of the sufficient statistic of classic random graphs (Bollobás 1998)—i.e., the expected number of edges—but in more general models it is desirable to base the definition of sparsity on all sufficient statistics and $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$ is a convenient choice. As a result, the size $c(1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2}$ of the deviation $\max_{\mathbf{z}} |\log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})|$ is small relative to the size of the random graph $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$ as long as $n_{\max}$ satisfies

$$n_{\max} \leq c_0 \left(\frac{\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})}{\|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty^2 n (\log n)^{3/2}} \right)^{1/2}, \quad c_0 > 0.$$

If, e.g., the random graph is dense, then $n_{\max}$ must satisfy $n_{\max} \leq c_0 n^{1/2} / \|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty (\log n)^{3/4}$. If the random graph is sparse in the sense that $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$ grows as $\|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty^2 n (\log n)^{3/2}$ —i.e., $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*)}(\mathbf{X})$ grows faster than $n \log n$, which is the rate of growth of the expected loglikelihood function at the so-called threshold of connectivity of random graphs with independent and identically distributed edge variables (Bollobás 1998)—then $n_{\max}$ must satisfy $n_{\max} \leq c_0$. These considerations suggest that as long as the neighborhoods are not too large and the random graph is not too sparse—i.e., the random graph is above the so-called threshold of connectivity—updates of $\mathbf{z}$ given $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be based on $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ rather than $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$.

4 Two-step likelihood-based approach

We propose a two-step likelihood-based approach that takes advantage of the theoretical results of Section 3 and enables massive-scale estimation of exponential-family random graph models with local dependence.

To describe the two-step likelihood-based approach, assume that $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)$ is the observed value of a random variable $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n)$ with distribution

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \text{Multinomial}(1, \boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K)), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

It is natural to base statistical inference on the observed-data likelihood function

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}).$$

The problem is that $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ is intractable, because $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ is intractable and the set $\mathbb{Z}$ contains $\exp(n \log K)$ elements.

The first problem can be solved by taking advantage of the theoretical results of Section 3, which suggest that $p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x})$ can be approximated by $p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x})$ provided that the neighborhoods are not too large and the random graph is not too sparse. A complication is that $p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x})$ may not be close when the neighborhoods are large, i.e., when $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S}$. However, the basic inequality

$$\sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) \leq \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) + \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S})$$

suggests that as long as the event $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S}$ is a rare event in the sense that $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S})$ is close to 0, $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ can be approximated by $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=0, \boldsymbol{\pi})$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) \approx \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} p_{\eta(\theta, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) \\ &\approx \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) \approx \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=0, \boldsymbol{\pi}). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the assumption that $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S}$ is a rare event makes sense in a wide range of applications, because communities in real-world networks tend to be small (see, e.g., the discussion of Rohe et al. 2011). Therefore, as long as $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{S}$ is a rare event, we can base statistical inference concerning the neighborhood structure on $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=0, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ rather than $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\pi})$. To simplify the notation, we write henceforth $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ instead of $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=0, \boldsymbol{\pi})$.

The second problem can be solved by methods developed for stochastic block models, because $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ is the observed-data likelihood function of a stochastic block model. There are many stochastic block model methods that could be used, such as profile likelihood (Bickel & Chen 2009), pseudo-likelihood (Amini et al. 2013), spectral clustering (Rohe et al. 2011), and variational methods (Daudin et al. 2008, Vu et al. 2013). Among these methods, we found that the variational methods of Vu et al. (2013) work best in practice. In addition, the variational methods of Vu et al. (2013) have the advantage of being able to estimate stochastic block models from networks with hundreds of thousands of nodes due to a running time of $O(n)$ for sparse random graphs and $O(n^2)$ for dense random graphs (Vu et al. 2013). Some consistency and asymptotic normality results for variational methods for stochastic block models were established by Celisse et al. (2012) and Bickel et al. (2013).

Variational methods approximate $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}) = \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ by introducing an auxiliary distribution $a(\mathbf{z})$ with support $\mathbb{Z}$ and lower bound $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ by using Jensen's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \log \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} a(\mathbf{z}) \frac{p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z})}{a(\mathbf{z})} \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} a(\mathbf{z}) \log \frac{p_{\eta(\theta_1, \theta_2=0, z)}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z})}{a(\mathbf{z})} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}). \end{aligned}$$

Each auxiliary distribution with support $\mathbb{Z}$ gives rise to a lower bound on $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$. To choose the best auxiliary distribution—i.e., the auxiliary distribution that gives rise to the tightest lower bound on $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ —we choose a family of auxiliary distributions and select the best member of the family. In practice, an important consideration is that the resulting lower bound is tractable. Therefore, we confine attention to a family of auxiliary distributions under which the resulting lower bounds are tractable. A natural choice is given by a family of auxiliary distributions under which the neighborhood memberships are independent:

$$\mathbf{Z}_i \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \text{Multinomial}(1, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i = (\alpha_{i,1}, \dots, \alpha_{i,K})), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

By the independence of neighborhood memberships under the auxiliary distribution, one obtains the following tractable lower bound on $\ell(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ (Vu et al. 2013):

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z}) \log \frac{p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) p_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(\mathbf{z})}{a_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\mathbf{z})} \\ &= \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \alpha_{i,k} \alpha_{j,l} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, z_{i,k}=1, z_{j,l}=1, \mathbf{z}_{-i,j})}(x_{i,j}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{i,k} (\log \pi_k - \log \alpha_{i,k}), \end{aligned}$$

where $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, z_{i,k}=1, z_{j,l}=1, \mathbf{z}_{-i,j})}(x_{i,j})$ denotes the marginal probability mass function of $X_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{-i,j}$ the neighborhood memberships of all nodes excluding nodes i and j .

In practice, we obtain the best lower bound by maximizing $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Direct maximization of $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is possible but inconvenient, because $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ contains products of $\alpha_{i,k}$ and $\alpha_{j,l}$. As a consequence, a fixed-point update of $\alpha_{i,k}$ would depend on $(n-1)K$ other terms $\alpha_{j,l}$ and hence fixed-point updates tend to be time-consuming and get stuck in local maxima (Vu et al. 2013). An elegant approach to alleviate the problem is to use minorization-maximization methods (Hunter & Lange 2004). Such methods construct a minorizing function that approximates $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ but is easier to maximize than $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$. A function $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ minorizes $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ at point $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}$ at iteration t of an iterative algorithm for maximizing $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ if

$$\begin{aligned} M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}) &\leq \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}) \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \\ M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}) &= \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}$ are fixed. In other words, $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ is bounded above by $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ for all $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and touches $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ at $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}$. As a result, increasing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ increases $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$. Vu et al. (2013) showed that the following function

1. Estimate $\mathbf{z}$ along with $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ by iterating:
 - 1.1 Update $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ by increasing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ with respect to α_i subject to $\alpha_{i,k} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{i,k} = 1$ and denote the update by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i^{(t+1)}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$).
 - 1.2 Update $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ by maximizing $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$:
 - Update $\pi_k^{(t+1)} = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_{i,k}^{(t+1)}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$.
 - Update $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \Theta_1} \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t+1)})$.

Upon convergence, we estimate the neighborhood membership indicators by $\hat{z}_{i,k} = 1$ if $k = \arg \max_{1 \leq l \leq K} \hat{\alpha}_{i,l}$ and $\hat{z}_{i,k} = 0$ otherwise ($i = 1, \dots, n$, $k = 1, \dots, K$), where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ denotes the final value of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
2. Estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \hat{\ell}_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

Table 1: Two-step likelihood-based approach.

minorizes $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ at point $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}) &= \sum_{i < j}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\alpha_{i,k}^2 \frac{\alpha_{j,l}^{(t)}}{2 \alpha_{i,k}^{(t)}} + \alpha_{j,l}^2 \frac{\alpha_{i,k}^{(t)}}{2 \alpha_{j,l}^{(t)}} \right) \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2=\mathbf{0}, z_{i,k}=1, z_{j,l}=1, \mathbf{z}_{-i,j})}(x_{i,j}) \\
 &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{i,k} \left[\log \pi_k^{(t)} - \log \alpha_{i,k}^{(t)} + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_{i,k}}{\alpha_{i,k}^{(t)}} \right) \right].
 \end{aligned}$$

The minorizing function $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ is easier to maximize than $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$, because it replaces the products of $\alpha_{i,k}$ and $\alpha_{j,l}$ by sums of $\alpha_{i,k}^2$ and $\alpha_{j,l}^2$. An additional advantage is that the maximization of $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ amounts to n quadratic programming problems, which can be solved in parallel.

We therefore propose a two-step likelihood-based approach as described in Table 1. We discuss the two steps below and conclude with some comments on parallel computing.

Step 1 The first step estimates $\mathbf{z}$ based on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. We do so by increasing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ with respect to α_i subject to the constraints $\alpha_{i,k} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K \alpha_{i,k} = 1$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$). We increase rather than maximize $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$, because maximizing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ is more time-consuming and algorithms maximizing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ are more prone to end up in local maxima than algorithms increasing $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$. Since $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ and $M(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)})$ depend on $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and both are unknown, we iterate between updates of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and updates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$. The updates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ are based on maximizing $\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\pi})$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ and are identical to the updates of Vu et al. (2013), because

$\theta_2 = \mathbf{0}$ reduces the model to a stochastic block model. As a convergence criterion, we use

$$\frac{|\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t+1)}) - \hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t)})|}{\hat{\ell}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(t+1)}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_1^{(t+1)}, \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(t+1)})} < \gamma,$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is a small constant. Upon convergence, we estimate the neighborhood membership indicators by $\hat{z}_{i,k} = 1$ if $k = \arg \max_{1 \leq l \leq K} \hat{\alpha}_{i,l}$ and $\hat{z}_{i,k} = 0$ otherwise ($i = 1, \dots, n$, $k = 1, \dots, K$), where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ denotes the final value of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Step 2 We estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ by using the Monte Carlo maximum likelihood methods (Hunter & Handcock 2006). Monte Carlo maximum likelihood methods exploit the fact that the loglikelihood function induced by $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, which is defined by

$$\ell_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\mathbf{z}})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})}(\mathbf{x}),$$

can be written as

$$\ell_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}}), s(\mathbf{x}) \rangle - \log \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})} \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}}), s(\mathbf{X}) \rangle),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ is a fixed parameter vector (e.g., $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ may be an educated guess of $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$). In general, the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})}$ is intractable, but it can be estimated by a Monte Carlo sample average based on a Monte Carlo sample of graphs generated under $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$. Therefore, we can approximate $\ell_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ by

$$\hat{\ell}_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}}), s(\mathbf{x}) \rangle - \log \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})} \exp(\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}}), s(\mathbf{X}) \rangle),$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})}$ is a Monte Carlo approximation of $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})}$ based on a Monte Carlo sample of graphs generated by using $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$. Hence $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ can be estimated by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \hat{\ell}_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

Additional details on Monte Carlo maximum likelihood methods can be found in Hunter & Handcock (2006). We note that the local dependence of the model facilitates parallel computing, which is discussed in the following paragraph. Standard errors of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ can be based on the estimated Fisher information matrix, although such standard errors are conditional on the estimated neighborhood structure $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ and therefore do not reflect the uncertainty about $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$. A parametric bootstrap approach would be an interesting approach for capturing the additional uncertainty due to $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$, but it would be time-consuming.

Parallel computing In Step 1, the maximization of the minorizing function amounts to n quadratic programming problems, which can be solved in parallel. In Step 2, the local dependence induced by the model implies that the contributions of the between- and within-neighborhood subgraphs to the loglikelihood function and its gradient and Hessian can be computed in parallel. Hence both steps can be implemented in parallel, which suggests that the two-step likelihood-based method can be used on a massive scale as long as the neighborhoods are not too large and multi-core computers or computing clusters are available.




Figure 1: Agreement of estimated and data-generating neighborhood structure in terms of Yule’s ϕ -coefficient based on simulated graphs with $n = 30$ nodes and $K = 3$ neighborhoods in the balanced and unbalanced case.

5 Simulation results

We first compare the two-step likelihood-based approach to the Bayesian approach of Schweinberger & Handcock (2015), which is the gold standard for small networks, and then assess the performance of the two-step likelihood-based approach on large networks. Throughout, we focus on undirected random graphs with sample space $\mathbb{X} = \{0, 1\}^{\binom{n}{2}}$.

To compare the two-step likelihood-based approach to the Bayesian approach, we focus on random graphs with $n = 30$ nodes and $K = 3$ neighborhoods, because the Bayesian approach is too time-consuming to be applied to large networks. We consider two cases. In the first case, called the balanced case, all 3 neighborhoods contain 10 nodes. In the second case, called the unbalanced case, the 3 neighborhoods contain 5, 10, and 15 nodes, respectively. In addition, we compare the two-step likelihood-based approach to the spectral clustering method of Lei & Rinaldo (2015), which ignores the model structure and estimates the neighborhood structure by spectral clustering; note that spectral clustering is an alternative to the variational methods in the first step of the two-step likelihood-based approach, as mentioned in Section 4. To assess the performance of the two-step likelihood-based approach on large networks, we focus on random graphs with $n = 2,500$ nodes in $K = 100$ neighborhoods. Once again, we consider two cases, the balanced case with 100 neighborhoods of size 25 and the unbalanced case with 20 neighborhoods of sizes 15, 20, 25, 30, and 35, respectively.




Figure 2: Agreement of estimated and data-generating neighborhood structure in terms of Yule’s ϕ -coefficient based on simulated graphs with $n = 2,500$ nodes and $K = 100$ neighborhoods in the balanced and unbalanced case.

In each scenario, we generate 500 graphs from the exponential-family random graph model with within-neighborhood edges

$$s_{1,k,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i < j}^n x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,k}$$

and transitive edges

$$s_{2,k,k}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i < j}^n x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,k} \max_{h \neq i,j} x_{i,h} x_{j,h} z_{h,k}$$

and between-neighborhood edges

$$s_{k,l}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i < j}^n x_{i,j} z_{i,k} z_{j,l}$$

as sufficient statistics and natural parameters $\eta_{1,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_1 \log n_k(\mathbf{z})$, $\eta_{2,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_2 \log n_k(\mathbf{z})$, and $\eta_{1,k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_3 \log n$, where $n_k(\mathbf{z})$ is the size of neighborhood k under $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}$. We use size-dependent parameterizations, because we do not want to force small and large neighborhoods to have the same natural parameters. The choice of the size-dependent parameterization used above is motivated by the sparsity of random graphs: e.g., in the case of classic random graphs which assume that edges are independent Bernoulli(μ) random variables, it makes sense to assume that there exist $c > 0$ and $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ such that the expected number of edges of each node—which is given by $(n - 1)\mu$ —is bounded




Figure 3: Estimates of parameter vector θ based on small and large networks in the balanced and unbalanced case; note that θ should not be confused with the size-dependent natural parameter vector $\eta(\theta, \mathbf{z})$. The red circles indicate the data-generating parameter vectors. The ellipses correspond to 95% quantiles of the fitted bivariate t -distribution.

above by $c n^\alpha$, because real-world networks are sparse. As a consequence, μ should be of order n^θ and $\eta = \text{logit}(\mu)$ should be of order $\log n^\theta = \theta \log n$, where $\theta = \alpha - 1 < 0$. In more general exponential-family random graph models with edge terms as well as other model terms, all model terms should scale as the edge term, so that no model term can dominate any other model term. These considerations suggest that the natural parameters of within-neighborhood subgraphs should be of the form $\eta_{i,k,k}(\theta, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_i \log n_k(\mathbf{z})$ ($i = 1, 2$, $k = 1, \dots, K$) and the natural parameters of between-neighborhood subgraphs should be of the form $\eta_{1,k,l}(\theta, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_3 \log n$ ($k < l = 1, \dots, K$). We note that the size-dependent parameterization imposes a form of local sparsity on within-neighborhood subgraphs and a form of global sparsity on between-neighborhood subgraphs. The strength of sparsity depends on the size of the graph as well as parameter vector θ .

We compare the three methods described above in terms of neighborhood recovery by using Yule's ϕ -coefficient:

$$\phi(\mathbf{z}^*, \mathbf{z}) = \frac{n_{0,0} n_{1,1} - n_{0,1} n_{1,0}}{\sqrt{(n_{0,0} + n_{0,1})(n_{1,0} + n_{1,1})(n_{0,0} + n_{1,0})(n_{0,1} + n_{1,1})}},$$

	Two-step likelihood-based approach	Bayesian approach
$n = 30, K = 3, \text{ balanced}$	46.6	14,735.1
$n = 30, K = 3, \text{ unbalanced}$	48.3	17,853.2

Table 2: Computing time in seconds: two-step likelihood-based approach versus Bayesian approach. The two-step likelihood-based approach did not exploit parallel computing in Step 1, but exploited 3 cores in Step 2 to deal with the $K = 3$ within-neighborhood subgraphs.

where

$$n_{a,b} = n_{a,b}(\mathbf{z}^*, \mathbf{z}) = \sum_{i < j}^n \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{z}_i^* = \mathbf{z}_j^*) = a) \mathbb{1}(\mathbb{1}(\mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z}_j) = b), \quad a, b \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Here, $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function, which is 1 if the statement in parentheses is true and is 0 otherwise. It is worth noting that Yule’s ϕ -coefficient is invariant to the labeling of the neighborhoods and is bounded above by 1, where 1 indicates perfect agreement of the data-generating and estimated neighborhood structure.

In the small-network scenario, we generate data by using between-neighborhood natural parameters $\eta_{1,k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = -.882 \log n$ and within-neighborhood natural parameters $\eta_{1,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = -.434 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}^*)$ and $\eta_{2,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = .217 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}^*)$. According to Figure 1, the two-step likelihood-based approach is almost as good as the Bayesian approach in terms of neighborhood recovery in the balanced case but worse in the unbalanced case. The worse performance in the unbalanced case may be due to the fact that there are smaller neighborhoods in the unbalanced case than in the balanced case and recovering small neighborhoods is more challenging than recovering large neighborhoods. However, while the Bayesian approach has a small advantage in the unbalanced case, Table 2 shows that the cost of the small improvement in neighborhood recovery is excessive: the computing time of the Bayesian approach is 370 times higher than the computing time of the two-step likelihood-based approach.

In the second scenario, we generate data by using $\eta_{1,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = -.621 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}^*)$, $\eta_{2,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = .311 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}^*)$, and $\eta_{1,k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*, \mathbf{z}^*) = -.511 \log n$. Figure 2 shows that the two-step likelihood-based approach outperforms spectral clustering in terms of neighborhood recovery in most cases. In the few cases where spectral clustering outperforms the two-step likelihood-based approach, the variational algorithms may be trapped in local maxima.

Last, but not least, we assess the performance of the two-step likelihood-based approach in terms of parameter recovery. Figure 3 shows that the estimated parameters are close to the data-generating parameter vectors, and more so when the number of neighborhoods is large. Once again, in the few cases where estimates are far from the data-generating

parameter vector, the variational algorithms may be trapped in local maxima. In such cases, the neighborhood recovery can be poor, which in turn affects the parameter recovery.

6 Application to large Amazon product network

We use the two-step likelihood-based approach to shed light on the complex structure of a large Amazon product network. The data on the Amazon product network were collected by Yang & Leskovec (2015) and can be downloaded from the website

<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/com-Amazon.html>

The network consists of products listed at www.amazon.com. Two products i and j are connected by an edge if i and j are frequently purchased together according to the “Customers Who Bought This Item Also Bought” feature at www.amazon.com. Amazon assigns all products to categories, which we consider to be ground-truth neighborhoods. We use a subset of the network consisting of the top 500 non-overlapping categories with 10 to 80 products, where the ranking of categories is based on Yang & Leskovec (2015). The resulting network consists of 10,448 products and 33,537 edges and can be found in the supplementary archive.

To model the Amazon product network, we take advantage of curved exponential-family random graph models. To capture the complex structure of within-neighborhood subgraphs, we use within-neighborhood edge terms, geometrically weighted degree terms, and geometrically weighted edgewise shared partner terms. The natural parameters of the within-neighborhood edge terms are given by

$$\eta_{1,k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_1 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}).$$

The within-neighborhood geometrically weighted degree terms are based on the number of products with t edges in neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$. The natural parameters of within-neighborhood geometrically weighted degree terms are given by

$$\eta_{2,k,k,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_2 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}) \exp(\theta_3) [1 - (1 - \exp(-\theta_3))^t], \quad t = 1, \dots, n_k(\mathbf{z}) - 1.$$

The within-neighborhood geometrically weighted edgewise shared partner terms are based on the number of connected pairs of products i and j in neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$ such that i and j have t shared partners in neighborhood $\mathcal{A}_k$. The natural parameters of the within-neighborhood geometrically weighted edgewise shared partner terms are given by

$$\eta_{3,k,k,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_4 \log n_k(\mathbf{z}) \exp(\theta_5) [1 - (1 - \exp(-\theta_5))^t], \quad t = 1, \dots, n_k(\mathbf{z}) - 2.$$

To reduce computing time, it is convenient to truncate the two geometrically weighted model terms by setting $\eta_{2,k,k,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = 0$, $t = 21, \dots, n_k(\mathbf{z}) - 1$, and $\eta_{3,k,k,t}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = 0$,

Term	Estimate	S.E.	Estimate	S.E.
Within-neighborhood edges θ_1	-.368	.002	-1.403	.014
Within-neighborhood degrees θ_2			1.086	.020
Within-neighborhood degrees θ_3			.760	.027
Within-neighborhood shared partners θ_4			.291	.003
Within-neighborhood shared partners θ_5			1.161	.004
Between-neighborhood edges θ_6	-1.197	< .001	-1.197	< .001

Table 3: Monte Carlo maximum likelihood estimates and standard errors (S.E.) of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_6$ estimated from the Amazon product network with 10,448 products; note that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_6)$ should not be confused with the size-dependent natural parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$.

$t = 13, \dots, n_k(\mathbf{z}) - 2$. The two thresholds 21 and 13 are motivated by the fact that no product has 21 or more edges and less than 1% of all pairs of products has 13 or more edgewise shared partners. Last, but not least, the natural parameters of the between-neighborhood edge terms are given by

$$\eta_{1,k,l}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \theta_6 \log n, \quad k < l.$$

The resulting exponential family is a curved exponential family (Hunter & Handcock 2006), because the natural parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ of the exponential family is a nonlinear function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}$. In addition, the natural parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ is size-dependent, because we do not want to force small and large neighborhoods to have the same natural parameters, as explained in Section 5. It is worth noting that the inclusion of the geometrically weighted degree terms helps model the connectivity of the network, while the inclusion of the geometrically weighted edgewise shared partner terms helps capture transitivity, i.e., the tendency of products i and k to be co-purchased when products i and j and products j and k tend to be co-purchased. Transitivity can arise when, e.g., (a) three products are similar (e.g., three books on the same topic); (b) three products are dissimilar but complement each other (e.g., a bicycle helmet, head light, and tail light); (c) three products, either similar or dissimilar, were produced by the same source (e.g., three books written by the same author); and (d) when customers become aware that products i and j and products j and k tend to be co-purchased, some customers might start co-purchasing i and k even though Amazon might not recommend co-purchases of i and k : e.g., when a new product i is introduced (e.g., a novel) and product i is known to be related to product j (e.g., a novel by the same author), and product j tends to be co-purchased with product k (e.g., a classic novel), then customers might start co-purchasing i and k even though Amazon might not recommend co-purchases of i and k .

Since we know the number of ground-truth neighborhoods, we set $K = 500$ and estimate the neighborhood structure by using the two-step likelihood-based approach. To assess the




Figure 4: Amazon product network with 10,448 products: goodness-of-fit of curved exponential-family random graph model. The red lines indicate observed values of statistics.




Figure 5: Amazon product network with 10,448 products: goodness-of-fit of stochastic block models. The red lines indicate observed values of statistics.

performance of the two-step likelihood-based approach in terms of neighborhood recovery, we use Yule’s ϕ -coefficient. Yule’s ϕ -coefficient turns out to be .964, which indicates near-perfect recovery of the ground-truth neighborhood structure. The Monte Carlo maximum likelihood estimates and standard errors of $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_6$ are shown in Table 3 and suggest that there is evidence for transitivity. The observed tendency toward transitivity has at least two advantages in practice. First, it suggests that Amazon might be able to improve recommendations by recommending customers of product i to purchase product k provided that i and k are connected to at least one other product, even though products i and k might not have been co-purchased in the past (see, e.g., example (d) above: i or k or both might be new products known to be related to existing products). Second, it suggests that Amazon might be able to partition large categories into small subcategories based on the transitive structure within categories.

To demonstrate that the curved exponential-family random graph model considered here can capture structural features of networks that simple models, such as stochastic block models, cannot capture, we compare the goodness-of-fit of the curved exponential-family random graph model to the goodness-of-fit of stochastic block models. Since the two models impose the same probability law on between-neighborhood subgraphs, it is natural to compare the two models in terms of goodness-of-fit with respect to within-

neighborhood subgraphs. We assess the goodness-of-fit of the two models in terms of the within-neighborhood geodesic distances of pairs of products, i.e., the length of the shortest path between pairs of products in the same neighborhood; the numbers of within-neighborhood dyadwise shared partners, i.e., the number of unconnected or connected pairs of products with i shared partners in the same neighborhood; the numbers of within-neighborhood edgewise shared partners, i.e., the number of connected pairs of products with i shared partners in the same neighborhood; and the number of transitive edges, i.e., the number of pairs of products with at least one shared partner in the same neighborhood. Figures 4 and 5 compare the goodness-of-fit of the two models based on 1,000 graphs simulated from the estimated models. The figures suggest that the curved exponential-family random graph model considered here is superior to the stochastic block model in terms of both connectivity and transitivity.

7 Discussion

The two-step likelihood-based approach proposed here enables massive-scale estimation of exponential-family random graph models with unknown neighborhood structure provided that the number of neighborhoods K is known. An important direction of future research are methods for selecting K when K is unknown. We note that even in the special case of stochastic block models, the issue of selecting K has not received much attention—with the exception of recent work by Saldana et al. (2017) and Wang & Bickel (2017). Extending such methods to the more general models considered here would be useful.

Acknowledgements

The research of both authors was supported by NSF award DMS-1513644.

Supplementary materials

The theoretical results of Section 3 are proved in the supplement. The data and R source code used in Sections 5 and 6 are contained in the supplementary archive. The R source code requires R packages `hergm` (Schweinberger & Luna 2015), `car` (Fox & Weisberg 2011) and `parallel` (R Core Team 2017).

References

Amini, A. A., Chen, A., Bickel, P. J. & Levina, E. (2013), ‘Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks’, *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 2097–2122.

- Bickel, P. J. & Chen, A. (2009), A nonparametric view of network models and Newman-Girvan and other modularities, *in* ‘Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences’, Vol. 106, pp. 21068–21073.
- Bickel, P. J., Choi, D., Chang, X. & Zhang, H. (2013), ‘Asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood and its variational approximation for stochastic blockmodels’, *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 1922–1943.
- Bollobás, B. (1998), *Modern Graph Theory*, Springer.
- Celisse, A., Daudin, J. J. & Pierre, L. (2012), ‘Consistency of maximum-likelihood and variational estimators in the stochastic block model’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **6**, 1847–1899.
- Chatterjee, S. & Diaconis, P. (2013), ‘Estimating and understanding exponential random graph models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 2428–2461.
- Daudin, J. J., Picard, F. & Robin, S. (2008), ‘A mixture model for random graphs’, *Statistics and Computing* **18**, 173–183.
- Fox, J. & Weisberg, S. (2011), *An R Companion to Applied Regression*, second edn, Sage, Thousand Oaks CA.
URL: <http://socserv.socsci.mcmaster.ca/~jfox/Books/Companion>
- Frank, O. & Strauss, D. (1986), ‘Markov graphs’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **81**, 832–842.
- Handcock, M. (2003), Assessing degeneracy in statistical models of social networks, Technical report, Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, University of Washington. <http://www.csss.washington.edu/Papers>.
- Hunter, D. R. & Handcock, M. S. (2006), ‘Inference in curved exponential family models for networks’, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **15**, 565–583.
- Hunter, D. R. & Lange, K. (2004), ‘A tutorial on MM algorithms’, *The American Statistician* **58**(1), 30–38.
- Kolaczyk, E. D. (2009), *Statistical Analysis of Network Data: Methods and Models*, Springer, New York.
- Lei, J. & Rinaldo, A. (2015), ‘Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **43**, 215–237.
- Liang, F., Jin, I. H., Song, Q. & Liu, J. S. (2016), ‘An adaptive exchange algorithm for sampling from distributions with intractable normalizing constants’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111**, 377–393.

- Lusher, D., Koskinen, J. & Robins, G. (2013), *Exponential Random Graph Models for Social Networks*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Nowicki, K. & Snijders, T. A. B. (2001), ‘Estimation and prediction for stochastic block-structures’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **96**(455), 1077–1087.
- R Core Team (2017), *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
URL: <http://www.R-project.org/>
- Rinaldo, A., Fienberg, S. E. & Zhou, Y. (2009), ‘On the geometry of discrete exponential families with application to exponential random graph models’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **3**, 446–484.
- Rohe, K., Chatterjee, S. & Yu, B. (2011), ‘Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic block model’, *The Annals of Statistics* **39**, 1878–1915.
- Saldana, D. F., Yu, Y. & Feng, Y. (2017), ‘How many communities are there?’, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* . accepted.
- Schweinberger, M. (2011), ‘Instability, sensitivity, and degeneracy of discrete exponential families’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**, 1361–1370.
- Schweinberger, M. (2017), ‘Consistent structure estimation of exponential-family random graph models with additional structure’. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.07801>.
- Schweinberger, M. & Handcock, M. S. (2015), ‘Local dependence in random graph models: characterization, properties and statistical inference’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* **77**, 647–676.
- Schweinberger, M. & Luna, P. (2015), HERGM: Hierarchical exponential-family random graph models, Technical report, Department of Statistics, Rice University.
- Schweinberger, M. & Stewart, J. (2016), ‘Consistent M -estimation of curved exponential-family random graph models with local dependence and growing neighborhoods’. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01812>.
- Shalizi, C. R. & Rinaldo, A. (2013), ‘Consistency under sampling of exponential random graph models’, *The Annals of Statistics* **41**, 508–535.
- Thiemichen, S. & Kauermann, G. (2017), ‘Stable exponential random graph models with non-parametric components for large dense networks’, *Social Networks* **49**, 67–80.
- Vu, D. Q., Hunter, D. R. & Schweinberger, M. (2013), ‘Model-based clustering of large networks’, *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **7**, 1010–1039.

- Wang, Y. X. & Bickel, P. J. (2017), ‘Likelihood-based model selection for stochastic block models’, *The Annals of Statistics* . accepted.
- Yang, J. & Leskovec, J. (2015), ‘Defining and evaluating network communities based on ground-truth’, *Knowledge and Information Systems* **42**, 181–213.

Supplement:

Massive-scale estimation of exponential-family random graph models with local dependence

Sergii Babkin

Michael Schweinberger

Proofs of theoretical results

To prove Theorem 1, we need three additional results, Lemma 1 and Propositions 1 and 2. To state them, let

$$g(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}) - \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $g(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ is considered as a function of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X}$ for fixed $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) \in \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z}$. Observe that the expectation $\mathbb{E} s(\mathbf{X})$ exists (Brown, 1986, Theorem 2.2, pp. 34–35), because $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \Xi$ and $\Xi \subseteq \text{int}(\mathbb{N})$ is a subset of the interior $\text{int}(\mathbb{N})$ of the natural parameter space $\mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the expectations $\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ exist, because

$$\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) = \langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbb{E} s(\mathbf{X}) \rangle - \psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}))$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}).$$

We first state Lemma 1 and Propositions 1 and 2 and then prove Theorem 1.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that a random graph $\mathbf{X}$ is governed by an exponential family with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ and local dependence. Let $f : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a function of within-neighborhood edge variables $(X_{i,j})_{i < j: \mathbf{z}_i = \mathbf{z}_j}^n$ that is Lipschitz with respect to the Hamming metric $d : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_0^+$ with Lipschitz coefficient $\|f\|_{Lip} > 0$ and $\mathbb{E} f(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{z}) < \infty$. Then there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}$, all $n > 0$, and all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|f(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} f(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{z})| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp \left(- \frac{t^2}{c K n_{\max}(\mathbf{z})^2 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^4 \|f\|_{Lip}^2} \right).$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 1 follows the proof of Proposition 1 of Schweinberger and Stewart (2017) and is therefore omitted. $\square$

Proposition 1. *Suppose that a random graph is governed by an exponential-family random graph model with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ and local dependence satisfying conditions*

[C.1] and [C.2]. Let $\mathbb{S} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a subset of neighborhood structures such that $n_{\max}(\mathbf{z}) \leq n_{\max}$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}$, where $n_{\max}$ may increase as a function of the number of nodes n provided $n_{\max} \leq n$. Then, for all $\delta > 0$, there exist $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2} \right) \leq \epsilon,$$

where

$$\epsilon = 2 \exp(-\delta n \log n).$$

Proof. To show that the probability mass of $g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ concentrates around its expectation $\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$, observe that the Lipschitz coefficient of the function $g : \mathbb{X} \times \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the Hamming metric $d : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_0^+$ is given by

$$\|g\|_{Lip} = \sup_{(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X}: d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) > 0} \frac{|g(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - g(\mathbf{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})|}{d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)}.$$

Since the term $\psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})) - \psi(\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}))$ of $g(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ and $g(\mathbf{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ cancels, we obtain

$$\frac{|g(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - g(\mathbf{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})|}{d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)} = \frac{|\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}), s(\mathbf{x}_1) - s(\mathbf{x}_2) \rangle|}{d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)}.$$

By condition [C.1] and the fact that $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim(\boldsymbol{\eta})}$, there exists $c_0 > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\frac{|g(\mathbf{x}_1; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - g(\mathbf{x}_2; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})|}{d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)} = \frac{|\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z}), s(\mathbf{x}_1) - s(\mathbf{x}_2) \rangle|}{d(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)} \leq c_0 n_{\max}(\mathbf{z}) \log n.$$

Therefore,

$$\|g\|_{Lip} \leq c_0 n_{\max}(\mathbf{z}) \log n \leq c_0 n_{\max} \log n.$$

By construction of $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$, the contributions of between-neighborhood subgraphs to the loglikelihood function are the same under both models, hence $g(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})$ reduces to a function of within-neighborhood edges which does not depend on between-neighborhood edges. Thus, by applying Lemma 1 to the Lipschitz function $g : \mathbb{X} \times \boldsymbol{\Theta} \times \mathbb{Z}$ of within-neighborhood edges with Lipschitz coefficient $\|g\|_{Lip} \leq c_0 n_{\max} \log n$ with respect to the Hamming metric $d : \mathbb{X} \times \mathbb{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_0^+$, there exists $c > 0$ such that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}(|g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{c^2 K n_{\max}^4 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^4 (\log n)^2} \right).$$

A union bound over the $|\mathbb{S}| \leq K^n$ neighborhood structures shows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{c^2 K n_{\max}^4 \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^4 (\log n)^2} + n \log K \right).$$

Choose $t = c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2}$, where $\delta > 0$. Then, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_\infty^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2} \right) \leq \epsilon,$$

where

$$\epsilon = 2 \exp(-\delta n \log n).$$

□

Proposition 2. *Suppose that a random graph is governed by an exponential-family random graph model with countable support $\mathbb{X}$ and local dependence satisfying conditions [C.1] and [C.2]. Then there exist $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,*

$$\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \leq c K n_{\max}^2 \log n.$$

Proof. By definition,

$$\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}).$$

By construction of $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$ and $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{x})$, the contributions of between-neighborhood subgraphs to the loglikelihood function are the same under both models, hence the expectation of the loglikelihood ratio reduces to the expectation of the loglikelihood ratio of within-neighborhood subgraphs:

$$\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{k=1}^K [\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k})].$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$|\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X})| \leq \sum_{k=1}^K |\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k})|.$$

The terms $|\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k})|$ can be bounded above as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k}) - \mathbb{E} \log p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k})| &\leq |\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbb{E} s_{k,k}(\mathbf{X}) \rangle| \\ &\quad + |\psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z})) - \psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}))|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z})$, $s_{k,k}(\mathbf{x})$, and $\psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z}))$ are the natural parameter vector, the sufficient statistics vector, and the log-normalizing constant of $p_{\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})}(\mathbf{X}_{k,k})$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1,k,k}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{2,k,k} = \mathbf{0})$. We bound the two terms on the right-hand side of the inequality above one by one.

First term. By condition [C.2], there exist $c_1 > 0$, $c_2 > 0$, and $n_1 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbb{E} s_{k,k}(\mathbf{X}) \rangle| &\leq c_1 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}\|_2 n_{\max}(\mathbf{z})^2 \log n \\ &\leq c_2 n_{\max}^2 \log n, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption that $\boldsymbol{\Theta}_{k,k}$ is compact.

Second term. By the mean-value theorem along with classic exponential-family properties, there exists $\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{k,k} = \alpha \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z}) + (1 - \alpha) \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z})$ ($0 < \alpha < 1$) such that

$$|\psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z})) - \psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}))| = |\langle \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z}) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}), \mathbb{E}_{\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{k,k}} s_{k,k}(\mathbf{X}) \rangle|.$$

Therefore, the second term can be bounded along the same lines as the first term, which implies that there exist $c_3 > 0$ and $n_2 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_2$,

$$|\psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k}, \mathbf{z})) - \psi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{k,k,0}, \mathbf{z}))| \leq c_3 n_{\max}^2 \log n.$$

Conclusion. Collecting terms shows that there exist $c > 0$ and $n_0 = \max(n_1, n_2) > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \leq c K n_{\max}^2 \log n.$$

□

Armed with Propositions 1 and 2, we can prove Theorem 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

Observe that, for all $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq t \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| + \max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq t \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq \frac{t}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |\mathbb{E} g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq \frac{t}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Choose $t = c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2}$, where $c > 0$ is identical to the constant c in Proposition 1 and $\delta > 0$. Then, by Propositions 1 and 2, for all $\delta > 0$, there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{S}} |g(\mathbf{X}; \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{z})| \geq c (1 + \delta)^{1/2} \|\mathcal{A}\|_{\infty}^2 n_{\max}^2 n (\log n)^{3/2} \right) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\delta n \log n}{4} \right).$$